REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **17 July 2006**, the examiner reviewed claims 1, 3-8, 10-15, and 17-21. Claims 1, 3-8, 10-15, and 17-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over alSafadi et al. (USPN 6,467,088, hereinafter "alSafadi"), in view of Henson et al. (USPN 6,167,383, hereinafter "Henson").

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Independent claims 1, 8, and 15 were rejected as being unpatentable over alSafadi in view of Henson. Applicant respectfully points out that the combined system of alSafadi and Henson teaches a reconfiguration manager receiving a reconfiguration request from a client (see alSafadi, col. 2, lines 27-33, and see alSafadi, col. 4, lines 12-13). This reconfiguration request includes a specification of the specific desired upgrade, such as upgrading software A from version 1.1 to version 2.0 (see alSafadi, col. 4, lines 13-15, and see alSafadi, col. 4, lines 48-50). The reconfiguration manager then determines if the requested upgrade and the current configuration of the client matches a known good configuration from a list of known good configurations (see alSafadi, col. 2, lines 37-41, and see alSafadi, col. 5, lines 22-25). If the reconfiguration manager cannot determine whether the requested upgrade and the current configuration of the client is a good configuration, the reconfiguration manager sends a response to the client indicating that the requested upgrade is not known to be valid (see alSafadi, col. 5, lines 28-32). Note that this is not the same as determining that the requested upgrade is invalid (see alSafadi, col. 5, lines 19-21).

In contrast, the present invention teaches determining memory upgrade options using memory configuration information for a computer system in response to receiving a memory upgrade request from a user (see page 10, lines 13-21 of the present invention). Note that, unlike in alSafadi, this memory

9

upgrade request does not specify a specific desired upgrade (see page 10, lines 13-14, see page 10, lines 19-21, and see FIG. 4, steps 402-406 of the instant application). Instead, the present invention determines the possible upgrade options that are available to the user based on memory configuration information and memory specification information (see page 9, lines 11-25, and see page 10, lines 17-21 of the instant application). The present invention then presents the possible memory upgrade options to the user who can select the memory upgrade option that the user prefers (see page 10, lines 22-25, and see FIG. 4, step 406 of the instant application). Note that this is in contrast to alSafadi, which teaches comparing a requested upgrade to a set of known upgrades instead of determining the upgrades that are available to the user. The present invention is advantageous because it determines the possible memory upgrade options for the user without assistance from the user. Therefore, the user does not need to be technically knowledgeable to select an upgrade option. Furthermore, the user does not need to continuously interact with a reconfiguration manager to determine a good upgrade option because the computer system presents all of the available upgrade options to the user.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 8, and 15 to clarify that the present invention determines a plurality of memory upgrade options that will work in the computer system and presents the plurality of memory options to the user to select a memory upgrade option. This amendment finds support on page 9, lines 11-25, on page 10, lines 22-25, and in FIG. 4 of the instant application.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 8, and 15 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 3-7, which depend upon claim 1, claims 10-14, which depend upon claim 8, and claims 17-21, which depend upon claim 15, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By   _Edward J. Grundler_
Edward J. Grundler
Registration No. 47, 615

Date: 15 August 2006

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95618
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665
Email: edward@parklegal.com